UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460



OFFICE OF CHEMICAL SAFETY AND **POLLUTION PREVENTION**

MEMORANDUM

Date:

09/07/2016

SUBJECT:

Cyantraniliprole: Chronic Aggregate Dietary (Food plus Drinking Water)

Exposure and Risk Assessments in Support of a Section 3 Registration Action for Uses on Root Vegetables (except Sugar Beet) (Crop Subgroup 1B), Leaves of Root and Tuber Vegetables (Crop Group 2), Legume Vegetables (except

Soybean) (Crop Group 6), Leaves of Legume Vegetables (Crop Group 7 except

Soybean), Peanuts, and Strawberries. Tolerance Requests without U.S.

Registration for Artichokes, Coffee Bean (Green), Grapes (Wine), Low Growing Berries (except Strawberries) (Crop Subgroup 13-07H), Olives, Pomegranate, and Tea (Dried). Amended Tolerance Requests for Cucurbit Vegetables due to

New Use Pattern and Amended Uses for Tomatoes and Peppers.

PC Code: 090098

DP Barcode: D435590

Decision No.: 488992

Registration Nos.: 352-856, 352-857, 352-858,

352-859, 352-860

Petition No.: 4F8258

Regulatory Action: Section 3 Registration

Risk Assessment Type: Dietary

Case No.: NA

TXR No.: NA

CAS No.: 736994-63-1

MRID No.: NA

40 CFR: §180. 672

FROM:

Meheret Negussie, Chemist Meheret Negustie Risk Assessment Branch III

Health Effects Division (7509P)

THROUGH: Douglas Dotson, Ph.D., Senior Chemist D. Rotson

Julie Van Alstine, MPH, Senior Chemist

Dietary Exposure Science Advisory Council (DESAC), HED

and

Barbara Madden, Acting Branch Chief

TO:

Jackie Herrick (Marchese)/Mark Suarez, RM 07

Invertebrate-Vertebrate Branch 3 Registration Division (7505P)

Gregory Akerman, Senior Biologist /Risk Assessor

RAB3/HED (7509P)

I. Executive Summary

A chronic aggregate dietary (food and drinking water) exposure and risk assessment was conducted using the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model software with the Food Commodity Intake Database (DEEM-FCID) Version 3.16. This software uses 2003-2008 food consumption data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, What We Eat in America, (NHANES/WWEIA). The analyses were conducted in support of a human health risk assessment for the proposed Section 3 requests on numerous commodities, including corn commodities (field, sweet, pop), root vegetables (except sugar beet) (crop subgroup 1B), leaves of root and tuber vegetables, legume vegetables, soybeans, leaves of legume vegetables, peanuts, strawberries, and an amended tolerance request for cucurbit vegetables due to new use pattern (greenhouse). In addition, analyses were conducted for tolerance without US registration requests for artichokes, coffee bean (green), grapes (wine), low growing berries (except strawberries) (crop subgroup 13-07H), olives, pomegranate, and tea (dried). This memorandum was reviewed by two peer reviewers of the DESAC, per DESAC SOP 2012.1.

Acute and Cancer Dietary Exposure

No acute dietary toxicity endpoint could be identified based on the toxicology data currently available for cyantraniliprole; therefore, an acute assessment was not performed.

The Cancer Assessment Review Committee (CARC) classified cyantraniliprole as "not likely to be carcinogenic to humans"; therefore, a cancer assessment was not performed.

Chronic Dietary Exposure Results and Characterization

A refined chronic (food and drinking water) dietary assessment was conducted assuming average field trial residues for all crops (except crop subgroup 1A), percent crop treated (%CT) where available, and percent crop treated for new uses (PCTn) data. In addition, the estimated percentage of imported grapes was incorporated into the assessment. The chronic assessment incorporated empirical processing factors, if available, or DEEM version 7.81 default processing factors, as appropriate. The estimated drinking water concentration (EDWC) was incorporated directly into the dietary assessment using the 1-in-10 year annual mean of 64 $\mu g/L$ from ground water estimates.

The results of this chronic analysis indicate that chronic dietary (food and drinking water) exposure and risk does not exceed HED's level of concern for the U.S. population and all population subgroups. The results of the DEEM-FCID analysis indicate that the risks are 34% of the chronic population-adjusted dose (cPAD) for the general U.S. population and 98% of the cPAD for children (1-2 years old), the most highly exposed subgroup.

Introduction

Dietary risk assessment incorporates both exposure and toxicity for any given pesticide. For acute and chronic assessments, the risk is expressed as a percentage of a maximum acceptable dose (i.e., the dose which HED has concluded will result in no unreasonable adverse health effects). This dose is referred to as the population-adjusted dose (PAD). The PAD is equivalent to point of departure (POD), no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL), lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) divided by the required uncertainty or safety factors.

For non-cancer chronic exposures, HED is concerned when estimated dietary risk exceeds 100% of the cPAD. References that discuss chronic risk assessments in more detail are available on the EPA/pesticides web site: "Available Information on Assessing Exposure from Pesticides, A User's Guide," 21-JUN-2000, web link: https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0780-0001 or see SOP 99.6 (20-AUG-1999).

The most recent (first) HED dietary risk assessment for cyantraniliprole was conducted by M. Negussie (DP# D407963, 01/29/2013).

II. Residue Information

Cyantraniliprole is a second generation ryanodine receptor insecticide. The crops registered in the U.S. include berries, citrus, cotton, oilseeds, pome fruits, stone fruits, tree nuts, and various vegetables [40 CFR § 180.672].

The residue of concern for tolerance enforcement in plants and livestock is the parent compound. The residues of concern for risk assessment in processed commodities are the parent compound and the metabolite IN-J9Z38. The residues of concern for risk assessment in ruminants are the parent compound, IN-N7B69, IN-MLA-84, IN-MYX98, and IN-J9Z38 (ROCKS D404411, July 24, 2012). Refer to (DP# D407961, S. Funk, 01/25/2013) for names and structures.

The residues of concern for drinking water assessment have been revised to include IN-JCZ38, IN-J9Z38, IN-K5A77, IN-NXX69, IN-QKV54 and IN-RNU71, in addition to the parent compound cyantraniliprole. IN-NXX69, IN-QKV54 and IN-RNU71 are all photolytic degradates and do not contribute to the ground water concentrations since photolysis is not an input into the ground water model.

The HED removed four major degradates from the residues of concern (ROC) expression since DuPont has provided information to show these degradates (IN-JSE76, IN-K5A79, IN-PLT97, IN-K5A78) are much less toxic than the parent compound, based primarily on physical-chemical properties and comparison of the results of repeated dose studies between cyantraniliprole and representative degradates (USEPA 2016c; DP 429265).

The USDA Pesticide Data Program (PDP) monitored pesticide residues in catfish in 2008, 2009, and 2010, and in salmon in 2013 and 2014. However, cyantraniliprole was not registered until about 2013 and PDP did not look for residues of cyantraniliprole in salmon in 2014; therefore, residues in fish were not included in the assessment. In general, pesticide residues would not be expected to be found in fish unless the pesticide bio-accumulates or has an aquatic use. To determine whether or not residues are present in fish, HED now routinely checks PDP monitoring data regardless of the pesticide's uses and physicochemical properties.

Residue Data used for Chronic Assessments:

HED used average field trial residues for all crops (except crop subgroup 1A), % CT where available, PCTn for some new uses, and % of grapes that are imported. The chronic assessment incorporated empirical processing factors, if available, or DEEM version 7.81 default processing factors, as appropriate. Empirical processing factors were used for potato flakes and chips, tomatoes (paste, puree, dried, and juice), orange juice, apple juice, cottonseed oil, citrus oil, and dried plums. Empirical processing factor for pear juice was translated from apple juice. The processing factors for these commodities were set at 1 because the residue input values included combined residues of the parent and the metabolite with relevant processing factors. DEEM default processing factors were used for dried beef (1.92), onion-dehydrated or dried (9.0), grapefruit juice (2.1), lemon juice (2.0), tangerine juice (2.3), dried apple (8.0), cranberry juice (1.1), cherry juice (1.5), dry pear (6.25), dry apricot (6.0), dry peach (7.0), and plum juice (1.4), dried coconut (2.1), and peanut butter (1.89). Crop field trial data depicting residues in/on the peel of citrus fruits (lemon peel and orange peel) was available; these values were included in the assessment. Cyantraniliprole residues were found to concentrate in wine grapes (2x) following processing of mature grapes with quantifiable residues. The proposed tolerance is for wine import only; therefore, no tolerance is recommended for raisins and grape juice. The EDWC was incorporated directly into the dietary assessment using the 1-in-10 year annual mean of 64 µg/L. Average field trial values were translated from the representative commodities to the other commodities according to HED DESAC SOP 2000.1.

Processed Commodities:

Average cyantraniliprole and the metabolite (IN-J9Z38) residues in the raw agricultural commodity (RAC) were multiplied by relevant processing factors to obtain the estimate of residues in the food as consumed. The result is combined and the total residue is used in the dietary assessment.

Meat, Milk, Poultry and Eggs:

Anticipated residues (parent plus metabolites of concern) were calculated for milk, and the ruminant fat, kidney, liver, meat, and meat byproducts. For all ruminant commodities, anticipated residues were calculated based on the dietary burden of dairy cattle. Anticipated residue/tolerances for swine and poultry are not needed for this

petition. Based on the ROCKS (D404411, July 24, 2012), metabolites (IN-N7B69, IN-MLA-84, IN-MYX98, and IN-J9Z38) that are relevant in each of the matrices were included for risk assessment purposes. Refer to Attachment 4 for the calculation.

Summary of Dietary Exposure Input Data

Average field trial residues for all crops (except crop subgroup 1A), % CT where available, PCTn for some new uses, and % of grapes that are imported were assumed. Default DEEM (ver. 7.81) and empirical processing factors were used as appropriate (DP# D407961, S. Funk, 01/25/2013). Table 1 presents the residue values for the registered/proposed uses. The complete details of HED recommendations are presented in the summary document (DP# D435591, M. Negussie, 08/15/2016) and Attachment 4 of this memorandum which provides the estimate of the anticipated residues.

Table 1. Residue Data Used for Cyantraniliprole Chronic Analyses.								
Matrix	Tolerance Level (ppm)	Highest Average Field	Average Field Trial Residue	Anticipated Residue (AR)	Experimental Processing Factors			
	(PP)	Trial Residue	(ppm)	1,2				
		(ppm)						
Root and tuber vegetables (Crop subgroup 1C)	0.15	0.110	0.024					
Potato flakes and chips			P = 0.024 M = 0.011	0.0254	Cyantraniliprole (P) = 0.6 flakes, chips			
					IN-J9Z38 (M) = 1 flakes, chips			
Crop subgroup 1A (Inadvertent Residue)	0.02							
Onion, bulb Crop Subgroup 3- 07A	0.04	0.027	0.015					
Onion, green Crop Subgroup 3-07B	8.0	4.1	1.60					
Crop Group 4	20							
Head Lettuce	5	2.7	0.955					
Leaf Lettuce	15	6.8	4.43					
 Celery 	15	9.1	2.783					
 Spinach 	20	13.0	6.243					
Brassica, head and stem Crop Subgroup 5A	3.0							
Head Cabbage	2.0	0.95	0.556					
• Broccoli	3.0	1.1	0.743					
Brassica, leafy greens Crop Subgroup 5B								
Mustard Greens	30	19	7.391					
Fruiting Vegeatbles Crop Group 8	2.0							
• Tomato	1.0	0.620	0.239		P = 3.5 Sundried; 0.09 Juice; 0.60 Paste; 0.19			
Tomato, sundried			P = 0.239	0.864	Puree			

DP# 435590

Cyantraniliprole PC Code 090098

Table 1. Residue Data Used fo	Table 1. Residue Data Used for Cyantraniliprole Chronic Analyses.							
Matrix	Tolerance Level (ppm)	Highest Average Field Trial Residue (ppm)	Average Field Trial Residue (ppm)	Anticipated Residue (AR)	Experimental Processing Factors			
Tomato, juice			M = 0.010	0.032	M 27 Deiad. 1 Inian			
Tomato, paste			_	0.185	M = 2.7 Dried; 1 Juice; 4.2 Paste; 1.3 Puree			
Tomato, puree	0.7	0.200	0.127	0.058	4.2 raste, 1.5 ruiee			
Bell Pepper	0.5	0.280	0.127					
Non-bell Pepper Conversit Variation Const	2.0	1.0	0.343					
Cucurbit Vegetables Crop Group 9	0.4							
Cucumber	0.3	0.160	0.155					
Muskmelon	0.4	0.185	0.110					
• Squash	0.2	0.110	0.061					
Citrus Fruits Crop Group 10	0.7	0.210	0.157					
Grapefruit	0.5	0.310	0.157					
• Lemon	0.6	0.300	0.198 $P = 0.413$	0.422				
Lemon-peel	N/A	0.625	M = 0.010	0.423				
Orange	0.7	0.390	0.209		P = 0.08 Juice; 6.2 Oil			
Orange Juice			P = 0.209	0.027	M 11 1 7 7 7 0 1			
Citrus Oil	2.4		M = 0.010	1.371	M = 1 Juice; 7.5 Oil			
Orange-peel	N/A	0.885	P = 0.463 M = 0.010	0.473	Residues from crop field trial data			
Pome Fruits Crop Group 11	1.5							
• Apple	0.5	0.310	0.168		P = 0.32 Juice; 1.4 Applesauce			
Apple, juice			P = 0.168	0.064	11			
Apple, sauce			M = 0.010	0.585	M = 1 Juice; 35 Applesauce			
• Pear	1.5	0.580	0.278					
Stone Fruits Crop Group 12								
• Cherry subgroup 12- 12A	6.0	3.800	1.179					
Peach subgroup 12- 12B	1.5	0.960	0.386					
Plum subgroup 12- 12C	0.5	0.280	P = 0.104 M = 0.010					
Plum, prune, dried				0.17	P = 1.5 Dried M = 1.4 Dried			
Berries and small fruits, bushberries (crop subgroup 13- 07B)	4	2.0	0.888		1.1 = 1.1 Billion			
Tree Nuts Crop Group 14-12	0.04							
Almond	0.04	0.023	0.013					
• Pecan	0.01	0.010	0.010					
Oilseeds Crop group 20	1.5							

Table 1. Residue Data Used for	r Cvantranili	iprole Chroi	nic Analyses.		
Matrix	Tolerance	Highest	Average	Anticipated	Experimental
	Level	Average	Field Trial	Residue	Processing Factors
	(ppm)	Field	Residue	(AR)	6
	41 /	Trial	(ppm)	1,2	
		Residue	41 /		
		(ppm)			
Cotton, Seed	1.5	0.990	P = 0.212	0.0238	P = 0.006 Refined oil
 Cotton seed, oil 			M = 0.010	0.016	
		0.11			M = 1.5 Refined oil
• Canola	0.8	0.61	0.157		
Sunflower Seed	0.5	0.320	0.10		
Coop Coleman 1D	0.40	Proposed	Uses		
Crop Subgroup 1B	0.40		0.03		
• Carrot			0.03		
• Radish	40		0.104		
Crop Group 2	40		8.025		
Sugar beet tops					
• Turnip tops	2.0		4.983		
Crop Subgroup 6A	2.0		0.322		
Snap bean			0.522		
Snow pea Crop Subgroup 6B	0.20		0.393		
Lima bean	0.20		0.017		
			0.017		
Garden pea Crop Subgroup 6C	1.0		0.004		
Dried bean	1.0		0.034		
			0.034		
Dried pea Soybean	0.40		0.134		
Crop group 9 (Established)	0.40		0.000		
Cucumber (green	0.70		0.155		
house)			0.133		
Crop Subgroup 13-07H					
Cranberry	0.08		0.022		
Crop group 20B (Established)	0.8				
Sunflower (new use	1.5		0.142		
pattern)	1.5				
Peanut	0.01		0.01		
Strawberry	0.5		0.329		
		gistration wi	ithout U.S Tol	erance	
Artichoke	0.1		0.031		
• Coffee	0.05		0.015		
Wine grapes	2.0		0.291		
• Olive	1.5		0.390		
Olive oil	2.0				
 Pomegranate 	0.01		0.01		
• Rice	0.015		0.01		
• Tea	60		13.04		
Livestock To	olerances/A	nticipated I	Residues		
Milk	0.20			0.12	
Fat (cattle, goat, and sheep)	0.10			0.01	

Table 1. Residue Data Used for Cyantraniliprole Chronic Analyses.									
Matrix	Tolerance	Highest	Average	Anticipated	Experimental				
	Level	Average	Field Trial	Residue	Processing Factors				
	(ppm)	Field	Residue	(AR)					
		Trial	(ppm)	1,2					
		Residue							
		(ppm)							
Meat (cattle, goat, sheep, and	0.06			0.01					
horse)									
Kidney (cattle, goat, and sheep)	None			0.01					
Liver (cattle, goat, and sheep)	0.40			0.01					
Meat byproducts (cattle, goat,	0.40			0.01					
and sheep)									

¹ AR for processed commodities AR = Cyantraniliprole (Average Residue) X Median Processing Factor (PF) + IN-J9Z38 (Average Residue) X Median PF; Residue of concern for processed commodities are parent and the metabolite (IN-J9Z38).

III. Percent Crop Treated Information

The following average percent crop treated estimates (D432594, D. Atwood, 09/01/2016), were used in the chronic dietary risk assessment for the following crops that are currently registered for cyantraniliprole: citrus: oranges 62%, grapefruit 87%, and lemons 46%; pome fruit: apples 61% and pears 76%; stone fruits: apricots 53%, cherries 48%, peaches 41%, and plums/prunes 59%; tree nuts: almonds 72%, hazelnuts 65%, pecans 22%, pistachios 49%, and walnuts 53%; bushberries (subgroup 13-07B): blueberries 45%; fruiting vegetables: peppers 45% and tomatoes 54%; cucurbits: cantaloupes 50%, cucumbers 23%, pumpkins 18%, squash 24%, and watermelons 29%; leafy vegetables: celery 70%, lettuce 78%, and spinach 53%; *Brassica* (cole) leafy vegetables: broccoli 81%, cabbage 50%, and cauliflower 83%; onion 58%; potato 50%; oilseeds: canola 15% and sunflower 35%; and corn 56%.

The following estimated percent crop treated for proposed new uses were used in the chronic dietary risk assessment (D432594, D. Atwood, 09/01/2016): cotton 41%; peanuts 41%; carrots 23%; soybeans 21%; strawberries 59%; vegetable crop group 7: dry beans/peas 6%, soybeans 21%, beans (snap, bush, etc.) 49%, and peas fresh/green/sweet) 38%; vegetable crop group 2: sugar beets 40%; vegetable crop group 6A: soybeans 21%, beans (snap, bush, etc., string) 49%; peas fresh/green/sweet) 38%; vegetable crop group 6C: dried bean and peas 6%.

For the imported grapes (wine grapes) 50% import estimate were used in the chronic dietary risk assessment (D433492, D. Atwood, 09/07/2016).

IV. Drinking Water Data

The drinking water residues used in the dietary risk assessment were provided by EFED (D433365, C. Koper, 06/12/2016) and incorporated directly into this dietary assessment. Water residues were incorporated in the DEEM-FCID into the food categories "water, direct, all sources" and "water, indirect, all sources." EFED is providing new estimated EDWCs based on the re-evaluation of various crops that are grown over two seasons per

year. The recommended EDWCs for ground water include the acute concentration of 70 μ g/L and post breakthrough average (chronic) concentration of 64 μ g/L.

For surface water, the FIRST (FQPA Index Reservoir Screening Tool) Version1.1.1 model was used to estimate drinking water concentrations. The EDWCs for surface water [acute = $43 \mu g/L$; chronic = $24 \mu g/L$] from the former drinking water assessment (DP403747, C. Koper, 11/21/2012) remain recommended for this assessment. The model and its description are available at the EPA internet site: http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/.

Based on Pesticide in Water Calculator (PWC) modeling the ground water EDWCs for various uses are presented in Table 2. The model (PWC; version 1.52) and its description are available at: https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/models-pesticide-risk-assessment). The Pesticide in Water Calculator, previously known as the Surface Water Concentration Calculator (SWCC), is not a new model but an interface that was used in this assessment for its ground water estimation capabilities for parent and daughter compound relationships that were not available with the Pesticide Root Zone Model- Ground Water (PRZM-GW) model.

Table 2. Cyantraniliprole Bounding EDWCs in Ground Water following Direct IN-JCZ38								
Degradate Conversion.								
		Upper-B	ound EDWC	Lower-Be	ound EDWC			
		Formati	ion Decline	Lab	oratory			
		Halt	f-Lives ¹	Half-Lives ²				
Application Rate	Scenario	Acute	Chronic	Acute	Chronic			
and Frequency	Scenario	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)			
Various Crops:	FL Citrus	47	42	2.0	1.9			
3 app. x 0.133 lbs	FL Potato	1	1	3.1x10 ⁻⁴	1.2x10 ⁻⁴			
a.i./acre x 2	GA Peanut	12	11	0.19	0.14			
seasons	NC Cotton	29	25	0.18	0.14			
(83% conversion)	Delmarva Sands	29	27	0.28	0.20			
	WI Corn	70	64	2.5	2.1			

¹ Upper-bound EDWC estimate generated by using the 90th percentile around the mean half-life (151 days) generated using the FD method for five available soils (246 days, 18 days, 115 days, 11 days, 19 days) for the aerobic soil metabolism half-life input.

V. DEEM-FCIDTM Program and Consumption Information

Cyantraniliprole chronic dietary exposure assessment was conducted using the DEEM-FCID, Version 3.16, which incorporates 2003-2008 consumption data from USDA's NHANES/WWEIA. The data are based on the reported consumption of more than 20,000 individuals over two non-consecutive survey days. Foods "as consumed" (e.g., apple pie) are linked to EPA-defined food commodities (e.g., apples, peeled fruit -cooked; fresh or N/S; baked; or wheat flour - cooked; fresh or N/S, baked) using publicly available recipe translation files developed jointly by USDA/ARS and EPA. For chronic

² Lower-bound EDWC estimate generated by using the 90th percentile around the mean half-life (25 days) from laboratory studies on the degradates for five available soils (24.7 days, 9.4 days, 19.5 days, 6.04 days, 30.3 days) for the aerobic soil metabolism half-life input. Recommended EDWCs in **bold** font.

exposure assessment, consumption data are averaged for the entire U.S. population and within population subgroups. However, for acute exposure assessment, consumption data are retained as individual consumption events. Based on analysis of the 2003-2008 WWEIA consumption data, which took into account dietary patterns and survey respondents, HED concluded that it is most appropriate to report risk for the following population subgroups: the general U.S. population, all infants (<1 year old), children 1-2, children 3-5, children 6-12, youth 13-19, adults 20-49, females 13-49, and adults 50-99 years old.

For chronic dietary exposure assessment, an estimate of the residue level in each food or food-form (e.g., orange or orange juice) on the food commodity residue list is multiplied by the average daily consumption estimate for that food/food form to produce a residue intake estimate. The resulting residue intake estimate for each food/food form is summed with the residue intake estimates for all other food/food forms on the commodity residue list to arrive at the total average estimated exposure. Exposure is expressed in mg/kg body weight/day and as a percent of the cPAD. This procedure is performed for each population subgroup.

VI. Toxicological Information

No acute hazard attributable to a single dose was identified; therefore, an acute dietary endpoint was not selected for quantitative risk assessment.

Based on the weight of evidence of the available scientific data, and in accordance with EPA's *Final Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment* (March 2005), cyantraniliprole may be classified as "Not Likely to Be Carcinogenic to Humans."

The toxicity endpoints pertinent for human risk assessment are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Toxicological Doses and Endpoints for cyantraniliprole for Use in Dietary Human Health Risk Assessments.							
Exposure/ Scenario	Point of Departure	Uncertainty /FQPA Safety Factors	RfD, PAD, Level of Concern for Risk Assessment	Study and Toxicological Effects			
Acute Dietary (General Population, including Infants and Children and Females 13-49 years of age)	No effect attri	ibuted to a singl	e dose was identi	fied in the toxicology database.			

Table 3. Summary of Toxicological Doses and Endpoints for cyantraniliprole for Use in Dietary Human Health Risk Assessments.						
Exposure/ Scenario	Point of Departure	Uncertainty /FQPA Safety Factors	RfD, PAD, Level of Concern for Risk Assessment	Study and Toxicological Effects		
Chronic Dietary (All Populations)	NOAEL = 1 mg/kg/day	UF _A = 10x UF _H =10x FQPA SF= 1x	cRfD = 0.01 mg/kg/day cPAD = 0.01 mg/kg/day	1-year oral study in dogs LOAEL =6 mg/kg/day based on effects indicative of liver toxicity (increased liver weights and alkaline phosphatase activity, and significant decreases in albumin level.		
Classification: "Not likely to be Carcinogenic to Humans" based on weight of evidence of data: No treatment-related increase in tumors incidence was						
dermal, inhalation)	demonstrated in rat and mouse carcinogenicity studies. No mutagenic concern was reported in the mutagenicity studies.					

Point of Departure (POD) = A data point or an estimated point that is derived from observed dose-response data and used to mark the beginning of extrapolation to determine risk associated with lower environmentally relevant human exposures. NOAEL = no observed adverse effect level. LOAEL = lowest observed adverse effect level. UF = uncertainty factor. UF_A = extrapolation from animal to human (interspecies). UF_H = potential variation in sensitivity among members of the human population (intraspecies). FQPA SF = FQPA Safety Factor. PAD = population adjusted dose (c = chronic). RfD = reference dose. LOC = level of concern. HED=human equivalent dose. HEC=human equivalent concentration.

VII. Results/Discussion

As stated above, for chronic assessments, HED is concerned when dietary risk exceeds 100% of the PAD. The DEEM-FCID analyses estimate the dietary exposure of the U.S. population and various population subgroups. The results reported in Table 4 are for the general U.S. population, all infants (<1-year-old), children 1-2, children 3-5, children 6-12, youth 13-19, females 13-49, adults 20-49, and adults 50-99 years old.

Results of Chronic Dietary (Food and Drinking Water) Exposure Analysis

For this chronic assessment, the U.S. population and all population subgroups have risk estimates that are below the Agency's level of concern. The highest exposure and risk estimates were for the 'children 1-2 years' population subgroup. The exposure for food and water was 0.009776 mg/kg/day, which utilized 98% of the cPAD. The results of the chronic dietary analyses (food plus drinking water) are reported in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Result of Chronic Dietary Exposure and Risk Estimates for Cyantraniliprole.							
Population Subgroup	cPAD,	Chronic Estimates (Foo	d and Drinking Water)				
	mg/kg/day	Exposure, mg/kg/day	Risk, % cPAD				
U.S. Population	0.01	0.003423	34				
All infants		0.006685	67				
Children 1-2 yrs		0.009776	98				
Children 3-5 yrs		0.006525	65				
Children 6-12 yrs		0.003898	39				
Youth 13-19 yrs		0.002455	24				
Adults 20-49 yrs		0.002917	29				
Adults 50-99 yrs		0.003126	31				
Females 13-49 yrs		0.002996	30				

The population subgroup with the highest estimated exposure/risk is bolded.

VIII. Characterization of Inputs/Outputs

The dietary exposure and risk estimates are refined since they assume average residues for all crops, %CT where available, PCTn for some crops, and include empirical processing factors. Additional refinements may be implemented such as the incorporation of additional %CT data, inclusion of additional empirical processing factors, and PDP data. HED concludes that the chronic dietary exposure and risk estimates are not underestimated.

IX. Conclusions

A refined chronic dietary (food and drinking water) exposure and risk assessment was performed for cyantraniliprole. The assumptions of this assessment were average residues for all crops, %CT where available, PCTn for some crops, % of grapes that are imported (wine), default DEEM 7.81 processing factors, and empirical processing factors. EDWCs from EFED were also included. The chronic dietary (food and drinking water) exposure estimates are below HED's level of concern (<100% cPAD) for the general U.S. population and all population subgroups. HED is confident that the assessment does not underestimate risk to the general U.S. population or any population subgroup.

X. List of Attachments

- 1. Attachment 1. Chronic Food Plus Water Residue Input file.
- 2. Attachment 2. Chronic Results files: Food Plus Water
- 3. Attachment 3. Chronic Results files: Food Only
- 4. Attachment 4. Anticipated Residue Calculation for Risk Assessment
- 5. Attachment 5. Estimates of Percent Crop Treated for Registered Uses of Cyantraniliprole.

Attachment 1. Chronic Food Plus Water Input File

Filename: C:\Users\mnegussi\Documents\DEEM Version

3.16\Cyantraniliprole\2016\Chronic\Final0607\ChronicCyantraniliproleMeanDairyCattle.

R08

Chemical: Cyantraniliprole

RfD(Chronic): .01 mg/kg bw/day NOEL(Chronic): 1 mg/kg bw/day

RfD(Acute): 0 mg/kg bw/day NOEL(Acute): 0 mg/kg bw/day

Date created/last modified: 09-21-2016/10:49:30 Program ver. 3.16, 03-08-d Comment: Average Residues-For all; EPA PCT; Empirical PF-potato flakes, orange juice, apple juice, tomato (paste, puree, juice), tomato dried, cotton seed oil, citrus oil, dried plum; water at 64 ppb; no juice, raisins, wine grape only; grape at 50%imported

_______ Def Res Adj.Factors Comment EPA Crop Code Grp Commodity Name (ppm) #1 #2 -----------0.015000 1.000 1.000 4F8248 9500115000 O Coffee, roasted bean

0802148000 8BC Eggplant
Full comment: 4F5258 greenhouse use

0802234000 8BC Okra
0.127000 1.000 1.000
0802270000 8B Pepper, bell
0802271000 8B Pepper, bell, dried
0802271001 8B Pepper, bell, dried-babyfood
0802270001 8B Pepper, bell-babyfood
0802270001 8B Pepper, bell-babyfood
0802272000 8BC Pepper, nonbell
0802272000 8BC Pepper, nonbell
0802273000 8BC Pepper, nonbell, dried
0802273000 8BC Pepper, nonbell, dried
0802272001 8BC Pepper, nonbell-babyfood
0802273000 8BC Pepper, nonbell-babyfood
0802273000 8BC Pepper, nonbell-babyfood
0802373000 8A Tomatillo
0801374000 8A Tomato
0801375000 8A Tomato
0801378000 8A Tomato, dried
0801378000 8A Tomato, dried
0801378001 8A Tomato, dried-babyfood
0801379000 8A Tomato, dried-babyfood
0801379000 8A Tomato, dried-babyfood
0801379000 8A Tomato, dried-babyfood
0801379000 8A Tomato, juice

| Per | Per

3600222001 36 Milk, fat-baby food/infant formu 0.120000 1.000 1.000 3600223000 36 Milk, nonfat solids 0.120000 1.000 1.000 3600223001 36 Milk, nonfat solids 0.120000 1.000 1.000 3600225001 36 Milk, nonfat solids-baby food/in 0.120000 1.000 1.000 3600225001 36 Milk, sugar (lactose)-baby food/ 0.120000 1.000 1.000 3600224001 36 Milk, water 0.120000 1.000 1.000 3600224001 36 Milk, water-babyfood/infant form 0.120000 1.000 1.000 3800221000 38 Meat, game 0.030000 1.000 1.000 3900312000 39 Rabbit, meat 0.030000 1.000 1.000 8601000000 86A Water, direct, all sources 0.064000 1.000 1.000 8602000000 86B Water, indirect, all sources 0.064000 1.000 1.000

Attachment 2. Chronic Food Plus Water Output File

U.S. EPA Ver. 3.16, 03-08-d DEEM-FCID Chronic analysis for CYANTRANILIPROLE NHANES 2003-2008 2-day Residue file name: C:\Documents and Settings\MNEGUSSI\My Documents\DEEM Version ${\tt 3.16} \\ {\tt Cyantraniliprole \verb| 2016| Chronic \verb| Final 0607| Chronic Cyantraniliprole Mean Dairy Cattle.$

Adjustment factor #2 used. Analysis Date 09-21-2016/10:52:30 Residue file dated: 09-21-2016/10:49:30 Reference dose (RfD, Chronic) = .01 mg/kg bw/day COMMENT 1: Average Residues-For all; EPA PCT; Empirical PF-potato flakes, orange juice, apple juice, tomato (paste, puree, juice), tomato dried, cotton seed oil, citrus oil, dried plum; water at 64 ppb; no juice, raisins, wine grape only; grape

at 50%imported ______

Total exposure by population subgroup

	Total Exposure			
Population Subgroup	mg/kg body wt/day	Percent of Rfd		
Total US Population	0.003423	34.2%		
Hispanic	0.003328	33.3%		
Non-Hisp-White	0.003440	34.4%		
Non-Hisp-Black	0.003180	31.8%		
Non-Hisp-Other	0.004026	40.3%		
Nursing Infants	0.002966	29.7%		
Non-Nursing Infants	0.008346	83.5%		
Female 13+ PREG	0.002995	29.9%		
Children 1-6	0.007509	75.1%		
Children 7-12	0.003614	36.1%		
Male 13-19	0.002440	24.4%		
Female 13-19/NP	0.002474	24.7%		
Male 20+	0.002769	27.7%		
Female 20+/NP	0.003220	32.2%		
Seniors 55+	0.003093	30.9%		
All Infants	0.006685	66.8%		
Female 13-50	0.002999	30.0%		
Children 1-2	0.009776	97.8%		
Children 3-5	0.006525	65.2%		
Children 6-12	0.003898	39.0%		
Youth 13-19	0.002455	24.5%		
Adults 20-49	0.002917	29.2%		
Adults 50-99	0.003126	31.3%		
Female 13-49	0.002996	30.0%		

Female 13-49

Attachment 3. Chronic Food Only Output File

U.S. EPA Ver. 3.16, 03-08-d DEEM-FCID Chronic analysis for CYANTRANILIPROLE NHANES 2003-2008 2-day Residue file name: C:\Documents and Settings\MNEGUSSI\My Documents\DEEM Version 3.16\Cyantraniliprole\2016\Chronic\Final0607\ChronicCyantraniliproleMeanDairyCattleF oodOnly.R08

Adjustment factor #2 used.

16.6%

Total Exposure

Analysis Date 09-21-2016/10:55:11 Residue file dated: 09-21-2016/10:54:25 Reference dose (RfD, Chronic) = .01 mg/kg bw/day

COMMENT 1: Average Residues-For all; EPA PCT; Empirical PF-potato flakes, orange juice, apple juice, tomato (paste, puree, juice), tomato dried, cotton seed oil, citrus oil, dried plum; water at 64 ppb; no juice, raisins, wine grape only; grape at 50% imported

Total exposure by population subgroup

Population Subgroup	mg/kg body wt/day	Percent of Rfd
Total US Population	0.002083	20.8%
Hispanic	0.002048	20.5%
Non-Hisp-White	0.002062	20.6%
Non-Hisp-Black	0.002074	20.7%
Non-Hisp-Other	0.002482	24.8%
Nursing Infants	0.001753	17.5%
Non-Nursing Infants	0.003888	38.9%
Female 13+ PREG	0.001733	17.3%
Children 1-6	0.005793	57.9%
Children 7-12	0.002497	25.0%
Male 13-19	0.001518	15.2%
Female 13-19/NP	0.001441	14.4%
Male 20+	0.001520	15.2%
Female 20+/NP	0.001812	18.1%
Seniors 55+	0.001797	18.0%
All Infants	0.003229	32.3%
Female 13-50	0.001666	16.7%
Children 1-2	0.007843	78.4%
Children 3-5	0.004896	49.0%
Children 6-12	0.002723	27.2%
Youth 13-19	0.001477	14.8%
Adults 20-49	0.001580	15.8%
Adults 50-99	0.001804	18.0%

0.001664

Attachment 4. Anticipated Residues for Risk Assessment.

Dietary burdens were previously calculated for livestock (DP# D407961, S. Funk, 01/25/13): beef cattle - 0.37 ppm; dairy cattle - 0.42 ppm; poultry - 0.01; swine - 0.011 ppm. For chronic dietary assessment, dietary burdens were calculated based on feedstuffs associated with all proposed and registered, using PCT/PCTn where available and processing factors. The estimated dietary burdens are 0.15 ppm for beef cattle, 6.78 ppm for dairy cattle, 0.01 ppm for poultry, and 0.01 ppm for swine.

	Mo	re Bala	nced Die	t (MBD)			
Cron	Commodity	Turno	Res	idue	%DM	%Diet	Dietary Contribution
Crop	Commodity	Type	ppm	input	%DIVI	%Diet	ppm
		Ве	ef Cattle				
Millet	Hay	R	0.14	Median	85	10	0.02
Barley	Hay	R	0.14	Median	88	5	0.008
Grain	Aspirated grain fractions	CC	1.93	Median	85	5	0.11
Beet, sugar	Molasses	CC	0.01	Median	75	10	0.001
Sorghum, grain	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	86	40	0.005
Barley	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	88	25	0.003
Soybean	Seed	PC	0.0069	Median	89	5	0.0004
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100	0.15
		Da	iry Cattle	;			
Turnip	Tops	R	6.425	Median	30	30	6.43
Soybean	Hay	R	1.806	Median	85	15	0.32
Apples	Pomace, wet	CC	0.0964	Median	40	10	0.02
Beet, sugar	Molasses	CC	0.01	Median	75	10	0.001
Sorghum, grain	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	86	25	0.003
Cotton	Undelinted seed	PC	0.0656	Median	88	10	0.007
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100	6.78
		ا	Poultry				
Barley	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	88	75	0.008
Soybean	Seed	PC	0.0069	Median	89	20	0.001
Cotton	Meal	PC	0.0066	Median	89	5	0.0003
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100	0.009
			Swine				
Barley	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	88	20	0.002
Millet	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	88	20	0.002
Rice	Bran	CC	0.01	Median	90	10	0.001
Rice	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	88	20	0.002
Sorghum, grain	Grain	CC	0.01	Median	86	15	0.002
Soybean	Seed	PC	0.0069	Median	89	15	0.001
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100	0.01

 $^{^1}$ R: Roughage; CC: Carbohydrate concentrate; PC: Protein concentrate. 2 OCSPP 860.1000 *Table 1 Feedstuffs* (June 2008). 3 Contribution = ([expected residue /% DM] X % diet) for beef and dairy cattle; contribution = ([expected residue] X % diet) for swine and poultry.

Crop	Commodity	Residue Input	Processing Factor4	%Crop Treated	Evaluator Comment
Alfalfa	Forage	0.01			Rotational
Alfalfa	Hay	0.01			Rotational
Alfalfa	Meal				
Alfalfa	Silage				
Almond	Hulls	1.6			
Apples	Pomace, wet	0.158	1	61%	
Barley	Grain	0.01			Wheat data
Barley	Hay	0.14			Wheat data
Barley	Straw	0.043			Wheat data
Beet, sugar	Molasses	0.01			Rotational
Beet, sugar	Pulp, dried				
Canola	Meal 1	0.102	0.1	15%	
Carrot	Culls	0.03		23%	
Citrus	Pulp, dried				
Clover	Forage	0.01			Rotational
Clover	Hay	0.01			Rotational
Clover	Silage				
Corn, field	Forage/Silage	0.01		56%	Seed Treatment
Corn, field	Grain	0.01		56%	Seed Treatment
Corn, field	Milled byproducts	0.01		56%	Seed Treatment
Corn, field	Stover	0.012		56%	Rotational Rotational Field corn
Corn, pop	Grain	0.01		56%	data) Rotational Field corn
Corn, pop Corn,	Stover	0.012		56%	data)
sweet Corn,	Cannery waste	0.01			Rotational
sweet Corn,	Forage	0.01			Seed Treatment
sweet	Stover	0.01			Seed Treatment
Cotton	Gin byproducts	3.1		41%	
Cotton	Hulls	0.16		41%	
Cotton	Meal	0.16	0.1	41%	
Cotton	Underlinted seed	0.16		41%	
Cowpea	Forage	1.005		6%	Dry shelled beans
Cowpea	Hay	2.9		6%	Dry shelled beans
Cowpea Crownvetc	Seed	0.01		6%	Dry shelled beans
h	Forage				
Fababeans	Seed				
Flax	Meal Aspirated grain	0.04	400		
Grain	fractions	0.01	193		Date:
Grass	Forage	0.011	l	[Rotational

Grass Hay 0.024 Rotational Grass Silage Lespedeza Forage Lespedeza Hay Lupin Seed Millet 0.044 Wheat data Forage Millet Grain 0.01 Wheat data Millet Wheat data Hay 0.14 Millet Straw 0.043 Oats Forage 0.021 Rotational Oats Grain 0.01 Rotational Oats Hay 0.059 Rotational Oats Straw 0.022 Rotational Oats Hulless Grain Pea Grain Pea Straw Pea, field Hay 7.425 6% **Primary Crop** Pea, field Seed 0.049 6% Primary Crop Pea, field2 Silage Pea, field2 Vine 1.3 6% Primary Crop Peanut Hay 0.64 41% Peanut Meal Pineapple Process residue Potato Culls 0.014 Potato 0.014 0.6 50% Process waste Rape Forage Rice Bran 0.01 Rice Grain 0.01 Rye Forage 0.044 Wheat data Rye Grain 0.01 Wheat data Rye Straw 0.043 Wheat data Safflower Meal Sorghum Forage 0.01 Rotational Sorghum Grain 0.01 Rotational Sorghum Stover 0.01 Rotational Soybean3 Forage 2.925 21% Primary Crop Soybean3 Hay 8.6 21% **Primary Crop** Soybean Hulls Soybean Meal 0.033 Soybean Seed 21% **Primary Crop** Soybean3 Silage Sugarcane Molasses Sunflower Meal 0.1 0.1 35% Trefoil Forage Hay Trefoil Triticale Grain 0.01 Wheat data Turnip Root

Turnip	Tops	6.425	Primary Crop
Vetch	Forage		
Vetch	Hay		
Wheat	Forage	0.044	Rotational
Wheat	Grain	0.01	Rotational
Wheat	Hay	0.14	Rotational
Wheat	Milled byproducts	0.01	Rotational
Wheat	Straw	0.043	Rotational

Expected secondary residues in meat and milk

The data indicate that quantifiable residues of cyantraniliprole occur in all cattle matrices (except in muscle at the lowest 3 ppm dose level) at all dosing levels. Quantifiable residues were also detected for some of the metabolites. Transfer factors for cyantraniliprole and metabolites were calculated for each matrix from the maximum residues of cyantraniliprole and its metabolites observed at the dose level closest to the RBDB in the dairy cattle feeding study. The maximum and (mean) residues and calculated transfer factors are presented in Tables 5 and 6. (DP# D407961, S. Funk, 01/25/2013).

Table 5. Ma	Table 5. Maximum (Mean) Residues of Cyantraniliprole in Cattle Commodities ² .							
Cattle Matrix		10.0 ppm						
	Cyan. IN-J9Z38 IN-MLA84 IN-MYX98 IN-N7B69 Total Residues (MW=473.7) (MW=491.7) (MW=441.7) (MW=489.7) (MW=489.7) Residues							
Milk	0.11	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.074	0.184		
Muscle	0.037 (0.026)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.037		
Liver	0.16 (0.15)	<0.01	0.099 (0.075)	<0.01	0.024 (0.021)	0.283		
Kidney	0.14 (0.084)	<0.01	0.017 (0.013)	< 0.01	0.031 (0.031)	0.188		
Fat ²	0.066 (0.042)	0.031 (0.023)	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.097		

¹ Metabolites that are <0.01 were not included

² Includes omental, perirenal, and subcutaneous fat.

Table 6. Maximum Anticipated Levels of Cyantraniliprole and Metabolites in Livestock Commodities Following Dosing at 1x the Dietary Burden.							
Commodity	Transfer factors ¹	Estimated Dietary Burden ²	Anticipated Residue	Recommended Anticipated Residue ³			
Milk	0.0184	6.78^2	0.125	0.12			
Muscle	0.0037	6.78	0.025	0.02			
Liver	0.0283	6.78	0.192	0.19			
Kidney	0.0188	6.78	0.128	0.13			
Fat ¹	0.0097	6.78	0.066	0.07			

¹ Transfer factor calculated by dividing residue value by feeding level. For all tissues, the transfer factor was calculated using the maximum residue value observed at the specified feeding level.

Expected secondary residues in poultry eggs and tissues

Residues of cyantraniliprole in eggs and tissues were below 0.1 ppm in all samples at the lowest dose group of 3 ppm (300X dietary burden). The parent compound was the major residue. Residue levels were dose dependent. Eggs seemed to contain the highest amount of residues, followed by liver, fat with skin and muscle. Transfer factors for cyantraniliprole and metabolites were calculated for each matrix from the maximum residues of cyantraniliprole and its metabolites observed at the dose level closest to the RBDB in the laying hen feeding study. Metabolite residues were not converted to parent equivalents since the molecular weights were close to the parent. The maximum and (mean) residues and calculated transfer factors are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7. Maximum Residues of Cyantraniliprole and Metabolites in Poultry.								
Cattle Matrix		3.0 ppm						
3				IN-MYX98 (MW=489.7)	IN-N7B69 (MW=489.7)	Total Residues		
Eggs	0.082	0.039	0.016	0.014	0.01	0.161		
Muscle	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05		
Liver	0.017	0.01	0.015	0.023	0.01	0.075		
Skin with fat	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05		

Table 8. Maximum Anticipated Levels of Cyantraniliprole and Metabolites in Poultry Commodities Following Dosing at 1x the Dietary Burden.						
Commodity Transfer Factors ¹ Estimated Dietary Burden ² Anticipated Recommended Tolerance						
Eggs	0.0537	0.01	0.0005	None		
Muscle	0.0167	0.01	0.0002	None		
Liver	0.025	0.01	0.0002	None		

² The estimated dietary burden for dairy cattle was used since this was the highest among the ruminants.

³ The highest expected anticipated residue for liver (0.19 ppm) was used for meat byproducts of cattle, goat, horse, and sheep.

Table 8. Maximum Anticipated Levels of Cyantraniliprole and Metabolites in Poultry							
Commodities Following Dosing at 1x the Dietary Burden.							
Commodity	Transfer Factors ¹	Estimated Dietary Burden ²	Anticipated Residue	Recommended Tolerance			
Skin with fat	0.0167	0.01	0.0002	None			

¹ Transfer factor calculated by dividing residue value by feeding level (3 ppm). For all tissues, the transfer factor was calculated using the maximum residue value observed at the specified feeding level.

Tolerances for swine, eggs, and poultry are not needed based on the conclusion that there is no reasonable expectation of finite residues in poultry commodities (a §180.6(a)(3) situation) (DP# D435591, M. Negussie, 08/15/2016).

Processed Food and Feed

Previously, processing studies were reviewed for potato, spinach, tomatoes, oranges, apple, plums, and cottonseed. The data indicate that residues of cyantraniliprole and the metabolite (J9Z38) concentrated in sundried tomato, dry tomato pomace, orange oil, apple puree, dry apple pomace, applesauce, and dried plums. Metabolite IN-J9Z38 was included for dietary exposure analysis. A tolerance was recommended for residues in citrus oil at 2.4 ppm (DP# D407961, S. Funk, 01/25/2013).

Processing studies have been submitted for olives and grape wine. Tolerances are not needed for most processed commodities, as parent cyantraniliprole did not increase from the RAC to the processed commodity. Cyantraniliprole did concentrate in olive oil (2x) and wine (1.7x). The data indicate that residue of the metabolite (J9Z38) did not concentrate. Separate tolerances were recommended for residues in olive oil and wine at 2.0 ppm (DP# D435591, M. Negussie, 08/15/2016).

Estimation of Anticipated Residues for the Processed Commodities

Crop field trial data were used to estimate anticipated residues for the processed commodities. Average cyantraniliprole and the metabolite (IN-J9Z38) residues in the RAC were multiplied by relevant processing factors to obtain the estimate of residues in the food as consumed. The result is combined and the total residue is used in the dietary assessment.

Anticipated Residue (AR) = Cyantraniliprole (Average Residue) x Median Processing Factor (PF) + IN-J9Z38 (Average Residue) x Median PF.

² The estimated dietary burden for poultry was used.

Table 9. Summar	Table 9. Summary of Processing Factors for Cyantraniliprole and IN-J9Z38.						
RAC	Dungaged Commodity	Processing Fact	or (Median)				
KAC	Processed Commodity	Cyantraniliprole	IN-J9Z38				
	Flakes	0.6	1				
	Potato waste	0.6	1				
	Peeled potato	0.6	1				
	Chips	0.6	1				
Potato	Wet peel	0.9	4				
	Culls	1	<u>.</u> 1				
	Fries	0.6	1				
	Unpeeled boiled	0.6	1				
	Unpeeled microwaved	0.6	1				
Spinach	Onpeeled inicrowaved	0.0	1				
Spinach	Leaves, cooked	0.16	95				
	Washed	0.18	1				
	Peeled	0.08	1				
	Sundried	3.5	2.7				
	Canned	0.08	1				
Tomato	Juice	0.09	1				
	Wet pomace	0.65	1.7				
	Dry pomace	1.8	3.5				
	Paste	0.60	4.2				
	Puree	0.19	1.3				
	T thee	0.17	11.5				
	Juice	0.08	1				
	Wet Pulp	0.20	1				
	Dry Pulp	0.38	1				
Orange	Meal	0.39	1				
	Molasses	0.08	8.9				
	Marmalade	0.08	1				
	Oil	6.2	7.5				
	Canned	0.077	1				
	Washed	0.57	1				
	Puree	1.1	1				
	Canned	0.12	1				
Apple	Frozen	0.95	1				
	Juice	0.32	1				
	Wet pomace Dry pomace	2.6	1 1.1				
	Applesauce	1.4	35				
Dlym							
Plum	Dried	1.5	1.4				
	Oil	0.03	1				
	(solvent ext) Refined oil						
	(solvent ext)	0.006	1.5				
Cotton	Meal						
seed	(solvent ext)	0.04	1				
	Hull	0.33	0.89				
	Oil						
	(cold press)	0.27	0.89				

Attachment 5. Estimates of Percent Crop Treated for Registered Uses of Cyantraniliprole (DP# 432594, D. Atwood, 09/01/2016).

Table 10. Estimates of Percent C	rop Treated for Regis	stered Uses o	f Cyantraniliprole	.
Crop Group/Crop	Market Leader Chemical	Market Leader Year	Market Leader Average PCTn (chronic)	Market Leader Maximum PCTn (acute)
Citrus –	Abamectin	2012		
oranges, grapefruit, and lemons	Abamectin	2013	64	67
	Abamectin	2014		
Oranges	Abamectin	2012	62	67
	Abamectin	2013		
	Abamectin	2014		
Grapefruit	Abamectin	2012	87	88
	Abamectin	2013		
	Abamectin	2014		
Lemons	Spinetoram	2012	46	54
	Abamectin	2013		
	Abamectin	2014		
Pome Fruit –	Abamectin	2012		
apples and pears	Chlorantraniliprole	2013	51	54
	Spinetoram	2014		
Apples	Chlorpyrifos	2012	61	66
	Chlorpyrifos	2013		
	Chlorantraniliprole	2014		
Pears	Abamectin	2012	76	85
	Abamectin	2013		
	Abamectin	2014		
Stone Fruit –	Esfenvalerate	2012		
apricots, cherries, peaches, and	Esfenvalerate	2013	41	45
plums/prunes	Esfenvalerate	2014		
Apricots	Esfenvalerate	2012	53	71
	Esfenvalerate	2013		
	Esfenvalerate	2014		
Cherries	Spinosyn	2012	48	50
	Imidacloprid	2013		
	Imidacloprid	2014		
Peaches	Esfenvalerate	2012	41	43
	Esfenvalerate	2013		
	Esfenvalerate	2014		
Plums/Prunes	Esfenvalerate	2012	59	61
	Esfenvalerate	2013		
	Esfenvalerate	2014		
Tree Nuts –	Abamectin	2012		
almonds, hazelnuts, pecans,	Abamectin	2013	25	26
pistachios, and walnuts	Abamectin	2014		
Almonds	Abamectin	2012	72	76
	Abamectin	2013		
	Abamectin	2014		
Hazelnuts	Esfenvalerate	2012	65	73

Table 10. Estimates of Percent C	rop Treated for Regis	stered Uses of	f Cyantraniliprole	·•
Crop Group/Crop	Market Leader Chemical	Market Leader Year	Market Leader Average PCTn (chronic)	Market Leader Maximum PCTn (acute)
	Esfenvalerate	2013		
	Esfenvalerate	2014		
Pecans	Chlorpyrifos	2012	22	26
	Chlorpyrifos	2013		
	Chlorpyrifos	2014		
Pistachios	Permethrin	2012	49	53
	Bifenthrin/Permeth rin	2013		
	Bifenthrin	2014		
Walnuts	Abamectin	2012	53	54
	Abamectin	2013		
	Abamectin	2014		
Bushberries – 13-07b*	Phosmet	2009		
Blueberry	Phosmet	2011	45	62
•	Zeta-cypermethrin	2015		
Fruiting vegetables –	Imidacloprid	2012		
peppers and tomatoes	Imidacloprid	2013	47	54
rir	Imidacloprid	2014	1	
Peppers	Imidacloprid	2012	45	51
Торрого	Spinetoram	2013	1	
	Chlorantraniliprole	2014	-	
Tomatoes	Imidacloprid	2012	54	66
Tomacoes	Imidacloprid	2013	-	
	Imidacloprid	2014	-	
Cucurbits –	Bifenthrin	2012		
cantaloupes, cucumbers,	Imidacloprid	2013	26	29
pumpkins, squash, and watermelons	Bifenthrin	2014		
Cantaloupe	Bifenthrin	2012	50	56
1	Imidacloprid	2013		
	Bifenthrin	2014		
Cucumbers	Bifenthrin	2012	23	28
	Chlorantraniliprole	2013		
	Bacillus	2014		
D 1:	thuringiensis	2012	10	20
Pumpkins	Bifenthrin	2012	18	20
	Cyhalothrin-	2013		
	lambda	2014	_	
	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2014		
Squash	Imidacloprid	2012	24	30
Squasii	Imidacioprid	2012	- L	30
	Chlorantraniliprole	2013	-	
Watermelons		2014	29	36
watermeions	Imidacloprid		- 29	30
	Imidacloprid Imidacloprid	2013	-	
Lasfy vacatables	Imidacloprid	2014		
Leafy vegetables –	Permethrin	2012	57	£ 1
celery, lettuce, and spinach	Spinetoram	2013	57	64

Table 10. Estimates of Percent C	rop Treated for Regis	stered Uses of	Cyantraniliprole	•
Crop Group/Crop	Market Leader Chemical	Market Leader Year	Market Leader Average PCTn (chronic)	Market Leader Maximum PCTn (acute)
	Spinetoram	2014		
Celery	Abamectin	2012	70	72
	Abamectin	2013		
	Abamectin	2014		
Lettuce	Imidacloprid	2012	78	84
	Imidacloprid	2013		
	Imidacloprid	2014		
Spinach	Permethrin	2012	53	61
	Spinetoram	2013		
	Spinetoram	2014		
Cole Crop –	Imidacloprid	2012		
broccoli, cabbage, and	Imidacloprid	2013	66	69
cauliflower	Imidacloprid	2014		
Broccoli	Imidacloprid	2012	81	87
	Imidacloprid	2013		
	Imidacloprid	2014		
Cabbage	Bifenthrin	2012	50	57
	Chlorantraniliprole	2013		
	Zeta-cypermethrin	2014		
Cauliflower	Imidacloprid	2012	83	88
	Imidacloprid	2013		
	Imidacloprid	2014		
Onion	Methomyl	2012		
	Methomyl	2013	58	61
	Methomyl	2014		
Potato	Imidacloprid	2012		
	Imidacloprid	2013	50	55
	Imidacloprid	2014		
Oilseeds – canola and sunflower	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2012	25	29
	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2013		
	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2014	1	
Canola	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2012	15	20
	Bifenthrin	2013	1	
	Cyhalothrin/Bifent hrin	2014	1	
Sunflower	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2012	35	41
	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2013		
	Cyhalothrin- lambda	2014		
Corn	Clothianidin	2012		
	Clothianidin	2013	56	59
	Clothianidin	2014]	

Source(s): Market Survey Data 2012-2014 and* USDA/NASS (2009, 2011, and 2015)

Table 11. Percent Crop Treated Estimates for Proposed New Uses (PCTn) of Cyantraniliprole.					
Crop Group/Crop	Market Leader Chemical	Market Leader Year	Market Leader Average PCTn (chronic)	Market Leader Maximum PCTn (acute)	
Cotton	Thiamethoxam Thiamethoxam Thiamethoxam	2012 2013 2014	41	45	
Peanuts	Phorate Phorate Phorate	2012 2013 2014	41	51	
Tobacco	Acephate Acephate Acephate	2012 2013 2014	56	63	
Root vegetables (Crop Group 1B) – Carrots	Esfenvalerate Imidacloprid Esfenvalerate	2012 2013 2014	23	45	
Soybeans	Imidacloprid Imidacloprid Thiamethoxam	2012 2013 2014	21	22	
Strawberries	Bifenthrin Bifenthrin Bifenazate	2012 2013 2014	59	66	
Vegetable Crop Group 7 – Dry Beans/Peas, Soybeans, Beans (Snap, Bush, etc.), and	Imidacloprid Imidacloprid Thiamethoxam	2012 2013 2014	20	22	
Peas Fresh/Green/Sweet) Dry Beans/Peas	Esfenvalerate Cyhalothrin/dimet hoate Dimethoate	2012 2013 2014	6	7	
Soybeans	Imidacloprid Imidacloprid Thiamethoxam	2012 2013 2014	21	22	
Beans (Snap, Bush, etc.)	Bifenthrin Bifenthrin Bifenthrin	2012 2013 2014	49	57	
Peas (Fresh/Green/Sweet)	Bifenthrin Bifenthrin Bifenthrin	2012 2013 2014	38	48	
Vegetable Crop Group 2 – Sugar beets and Carrots	Clothianidin Imidacloprid Clothianidin	2012 2013 2014	40	45	
Sugar beets	Clothianidin Clothianidin Clothianidin	2012 2013 2014	40	45	
Carrots	Esfenvalerate Imidacloprid Esfenvalerate	2012 2013 2014	24	45	
Vegetable Crop Group 6A –	Imidacloprid Imidacloprid	2012 2013	21	22	

Cyantraniliprole PC Code 090098

Table 11. Percent Crop Treated	Table 11. Percent Crop Treated Estimates for Proposed New Uses (PCTn) of Cyantraniliprole.						
Crop Group/Crop	Market Leader Chemical	Market Leader Year	Market Leader Average PCTn (chronic)	Market Leader Maximum			
Soybeans, Beans (Snap, Bush, etc., String), and Peas (Fresh/Green/Sweet)	Thiamethoxam	2014		PCTn (acute)			
Soybeans	Imidacloprid	2012	21	22			
	Imidacloprid	2013					
	Thiamethoxam	2014					
Beans (Snap, Bush, String, etc.)	Bifenthrin	2012	49	57			
	Bifenthrin	2013					
	Bifenthrin	2014					
Peas (Fresh/Green/Sweet)	Bifenthrin	2012	38	48			
	Bifenthrin	2013					
	Bifenthrin	2014					
Vegetable Crop Group 6C –	Esfenvalerate	2012					
Dried bean and peas	Cyhalothrin-	2013	6	7			
	lambda						
	Dimethoate	2014					

Source: Market Research Data 2012-2014.